## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

#### FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

## CENTRAL DIVISION

		FILEU
In re:	)	2020 AUG 12 PM 3:11
	)	CLERK
UNITED STATES OF	)	U.S. DISTRICT COURT
AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
VS.	)	Case No.
	)	2:20-CR-00182
CHRISTOPHER ISIDRO	)	
ROJAS,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

## BEFORE THE HONORABLE JARED C. BENNETT

August 4, 2020

Transcript of Electronically Recorded Hearing

### Appearances of Counsel:

For the Plaintiff: J. Drew Yeates

Bryan Reeves Michael Thorpe Attorneys at Law

US Attorney's Office (UT) 185 South State Street

Suite 300

Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

For the Defendant: Frank A. Berardi

Attorney at Law

Frank A. Berardi, PC 3378 South 275 East

Salt Lake City, Utah 84115

Court Reporter:

Laura W. Robinson, RPR, FCRR, CSR, CP 351 South West Temple 8.430 U.S. Courthouse Salt Lake City, Utah 84101 (801)328-4800

# Salt Lake City, Utah, August 4, 2020

THE COURT: This is a reminder. This is federal court still, and so if -- the rules against recording are still in effect and so we ask all of you please not to record this proceeding. The official record will be kept here in federal court which I will be keeping here as we go.

Let's go on the record in the case of the United States of America versus Christopher Isidro Rojas. This is case 2:20-CR-182. This is on a Superseding Indictment on one count under 18 USC 844(i), Arson in Interstate Commerce.

Before we get started, could I please have counsel state their appearances for the record and let's begin with the United States.

MR. YEATES: Your Honor, Drew Yeates on behalf of the United States. I'm also here with AUSA Reeves and Thorpe.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. BERARDI: Frank Berardi, Your Honor, for Mr. Rojas.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I will note there are also numerous other people who are observing this proceeding, and we do not need to

identify them at this time.

Let's first proceed with this current COVID situation we have. Mr. Rojas you, of course, have the right to an in-person appearance for purposes of this initial appearance and arraignment today.

Unfortunately, because of the pandemic, the Court is closed at least until September. We'll see if that date holds. Do you waive your right to an in-person appearance and choose instead to proceed by way of video teleconference today?

THE DEFENDANT: I am okay with proceeding with the video conference.

THE COURT: Thank you. I will accept that as a knowing and voluntary --

THE DEFENDANT: And the safety of everybody.

I understand what's going on right now and would like
to obviously take the safest route for sure.

THE COURT: Thank you. And I very much appreciate your accommodation and we'll find that it is a knowing and voluntary waiver of your right to in-person appearance and we will proceed today by way of video teleconference.

Before we get going, I want to inform you Mr. Rojas of two very important rights that you have under the United States Constitution. The first is

under the Fifth Amendment you have a right to remain silent. And I would encourage you not to say anything without first discussing with your lawyer. Because if you do say things, they may be used against you in a subsequent proceeding.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Now your second important right is that of having an attorney present to assist you at all stages of this proceeding. That is your right under the Sixth Amendment.

My understanding is that you have retained Mr. Berardi to represent you. Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: That is correct.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Berardi, just by way of note, um, I understand that, I just want to make sure that you understand, that in the event that Mr. Rojas would be unable to pay you in the future, there is at least a possibility that you may be asked to take this case pro bono. Do you understand that?

MR. BERARDI: I understand that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. So we're here on the Indictment which is alleging one count. Have you had a chance, Mr. Berardi, to review this one count Indictment with your client?

MR. BERARDI: Not with my client, Your

1 Honor, no. I reviewed it just today and last -- well 2 and yesterday when I received it. 3 THE COURT: Would you like a few minutes to meet with Mr. Rojas to go over that Indictment before 4 5 we get started? 6 MR. BERARDI: Yes, that would be nice, Your 7 Honor. 8 THE COURT: About how much time would you 9 need? 10 MR. BERARDI: I would say ten minutes. 11 THE COURT: Ten minutes. What I'm going to 12 do, Mr. Rojas, is I am going to put you and 13 Mr. Berardi in a breakout room here on Zoom. No one 14 else can get into it, it will just be the two of you, 15 I don't get into it. I'm going to set the clock for 16 ten minutes so everyone who is observing these 17 proceeding will know what time we'll reconvene. I'll 18 give you a one minute warning when they close the 19 breakout room and then you will be merged back into 20 our conversation here. Does that sound acceptable? 21 MR. BERARDI: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Let me do that. 24 MR. BERARDI: Can you hear me, Chris?

THE COURT: We're not there yet. Hold on

25

1 just a second. 2 THE DEFENDANT: I can still see everybody. 3 THE COURT: All right. Here we go. I'm going to send you, you'll have to press a button. 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: You bet. 7 (Brief pause in proceedings.) MR. BERARDI: Your Honor? 8 9 THE COURT: Let me see here. It looks like 10 you're back a little bit early. 11 MR. BERARDI: Yes, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Perfect we will proceed 13 accordingly. So we'll go back on the record. And 14 now that you have had a chance to speak with 15 Mr. Rojas, just do a video here, there we go, that's 16 better. Now that you have had a chance to speak with 17 Mr. Rojas, let's go over the Indictment. Do you 18 desire, first of all, Mr. Berardi, do you desire a 19 formal reading of the Indictment? 20 MR. BERARDI: No, Your Honor. We have gone 2.1 over it. We'll waive the reading. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Yeates, what is the maximum 23 penalty for Count 1 of the Indictment? 24 MR. YEATES: Your Honor, the maximum 25 possible penalty is 20 years in prison and a fine of

1 \$250,000. If convicted, there is a minimum mandatory 2 period of incarceration of five years. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Rojas, as to Count 1 in the Superseding 4 5 Indictment, how do you plead, guilty or not guilty? 6 THE DEFENDANT: I would plead not guilty. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. I will accept your 8 not guilty plea. 9 Mr. Yeates, what is the outside date in this 10 case? 11 MR. YEATES: Your Honor, the outside date is 12 October 13th. However, another co-defendant has 13 appeared previously and a trial has been scheduled 14 before the assigned district court judge for the 2nd 15 day of October. And we would ask the Court to schedule the same deadlines. 16 17 MR. BERARDI: Did you say October 2nd? 18 THE COURT: Mr. Berardi, do you have any 19 objection to the same deadlines applying in the, as 20 to the other co-defendants, applying to your client? 21 MR. BERARDI: Your Honor, I don't think so. 22 I didn't hear the last date. Did we say the trial in 23 the other case was set for October 2nd? 24 THE COURT: Mr. Yeates? 25 MR. YEATES: That's right.

MR. BERARDI: Okay. That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So the motion cut offs, the plea cut offs, all of the other deadlines that are already set in this case will then therefore apply to

Mr. Rojas as well. And, of course, to the extent there needs to be a motion, a Speedy Trial Act to extend the time for who knows what reasons, we're in 2020 so who knows what is going to happen, of course the Court will take those under advisement.

And Mr. Yeates, what is the United States' position on detention?

MR. YEATES: Your Honor, we are seeking detention in this case.

THE COURT: Mr. Berardi, is the Defendant contesting detention in this matter?

MR. BERARDI: He is, Your Honor. Um, I just
-- I read the Presentence Report or Pretrial Report.

You know, there is four, I think, four contentions
that they're concerned for his nonappearance.

THE COURT: Well Mr. Berardi, I don't mean to cut you off, but before we go there what I plan on doing is having the United States go first because they bear the burden, well at least there is a presumption here, but have them go first and then I

will have you articulate why your client overcomes the presumption of detention here, and then we'll go from there.

So Mr. Yeates, are you going to be making the argument on behalf of the United States?

MR. YEATES: I am, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Please proceed.

MR. YEATES: Your Honor, to begin, I filed a memorandum related to detention and that is

Document 59. I hope that Your Honor has had an opportunity to view that. I also hope that

Mr. Berardi has had an opportunity to see it.

But in summary, Your Honor, the United

States seeks detention pursuant to section 3142(f).

And the basis for that is really twofold. One, he is charged with a crime of violence. Um, also, Your

Honor, he is charged with an offense listed under section 2332b(g)5(B). And as a third potential reason for detention, Your Honor, we believe that he presents a serious risk of flight.

With that said, Your Honor, it is the position of the United States that in this case a presumption of detention applies. I would mention, Your Honor, that co-defendants who have already appeared before another magistrate judge as well as

the District Court Judge, the judges have all found that indeed there is a presumption of detention. But for the benefit of the record, I will indicate that the presumption of detention applies because the offense is one listed under 18 United States Code Section 2332b subsection (g) 5(B).

And with that presumption, Your Honor, I would indicate to the Court that as Your Honor well knows, the courts have looked at this presumption of detention, they have found it is not a bursting bubble, meaning that even if the defense is to proffer evidence that might rebut that presumption, the fact that congress has found that a certain type of individual presents a nonmanageable risk of flight and a nonmanageable danger to the community should continue to be considered by the Court.

Now, Your Honor, if the Court would like me to go into my full argument, I'm prepared to do that as well.

THE COURT: Yes, please. I mean I understand this is a presumption case given the charge bend pending in Count 1 of the Indictment, so please go ahead and let me know what the argument is on behalf of the United States on behalf of detention.

MR. YEATES: Your Honor, looking at the Pretrial Services Report there are a few things that stick out. One is that the Defendant didn't appear to be completely candid in his discussions with Pretrial Services. In fact, there appear to be a number of facts where he and his mother disagree. I think that the Court should be concerned about that.

2.1

The other thing that is clear in the report is that Mr. Rojas has an issue, a problem with substance abuse, namely with alcohol, and I will discuss that a little more in a moment. But it also appears that he has frequently used THC or marijuana products although he indicates that he has used those products when he is in states where it's legal.

Your Honor, I would like to pull up a document to help guide the remainder of my argument, but I will be showing, with the Court's permission, a number of photographs and a short video related to the Defendant and the allegations. But I have covered now, Your Honor, the presumption of detention. I also want to discuss briefly four different sections related to the detention statute here under 3142.

First, Your Honor, I would like to discuss the nature and circumstances of the offense. And as

the Court may well know from looking through the documents in this case, this case is a result of a riot that took place in Salt Lake City.

Now the United States will concede that prior to the riot there was a demonstration. And it was for a time a lawful demonstration.

Unfortunately, a number of individuals decided to begin causing damage to public facilities, to private businesses, and in this case to a Salt Lake City patrol car.

Indeed, the patrol car was overturned and the Defendant in this case, Mr. Rojas, helped in the destruction of that vehicle. He started by ripping pieces off the patrol car. And then, Your Honor, he participated in burning that car and it was completely destroyed.

When I look under Section 3142(g), I believe that the Court should easily find that the factors weigh heavily in favor of detention as to the nature and circumstances of the offense.

Turning to sub paragraph (g)(2), the weight of the evidence, it is at this time, Your Honor, that I would ask for the ability to have my co-counsel Mr. Reeves show eight separate exhibits. May he, Your Honor, take control and then show these exhibits?

THE COURT: Yes. I believe he should have 1 2 the ability to share his screen. 3 MR. REEVES: Thank you, Your Honor. One 4 moment. 5 MR. YEATES: Mr. Reeves, if we can just 6 start with Exhibit 1. 7 MR. REEVES: Your Honor, can you hear me? THE COURT: Yes. 8 9 MR. REEVES: Let's try that again. Here we 10 go. 11 MR. YEATES: Your Honor, Exhibit 1 is a 12 screen capture of a video at the riot which depicts 13 Mr. Rojas ripping a bumper off of the police car. 14 As you can see from the photograph, it shows 15 the play feature and that's because this was taken 16 from a video. But you'll see on the left-hand side 17 an individual wearing a red and black long-sleeve 18 shirts, khaki pants, and what appear to be Van shoes. 19 That is Mr. Rojas. And you can see there as he is 20 pulling back ripping the bumper off of the Salt Lake 21 City patrol car. 22 Mr. Reeves, if you can please show 23 Government's Exhibit 2. 24 MR. REEVES: Can that be seen by all? 25 THE COURT: Yes.

MR. YEATES: It can. Your Honor, this is a similar photograph. It shows Mr. Rojas again ripping a part of the patrol car off after the car had been overturned.

2.1

Mr. Reeves, Exhibit 3, please. Now, Your Honor, to give the Court an understanding of this photograph, to the left of where these two individuals are standing, is the overturned patrol car. And the individual wearing what appears to be a white medical mask is Mr. Rojas. To the right, is an unidentified co-conspirator. And what they are holding is a white fabric of some sort. It might be a tablecloth or a bed sheet, but it is a white cloth fabric. And you will see in Mr. Rojas's hand what appears to be a Bic lighter. And you will see that with his left hand he is manipulating the fabric, and with the right hand he is lighting it aflame.

Mr. Reeves, could we have Exhibit 4, please.

MR. REEVES: Can that be seen by all?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. YEATES: Your Honor, what you will see here is the unidentified co-conspirator wearing a gas mask, he is still holding the fabric which is now beginning to burn. And you will see Mr. Rojas's hand as he points at the flame. The two of them are

facing the patrol car. And although it's difficult to make out the conversation they're having, the intent of the two was to throw this toward the patrol car into the interior of the patrol car that already had windows broken out in order to light the patrol car aflame.

Mr. Reeves, Exhibit 4 -- or excuse me, Exhibit 5, please.

In this photograph, Your Honor, you will see
Mr. Rojas on the left-hand side of his
co-conspirator, the co-conspirator with his right
hand tosses the burning fabric and it is headed
towards the patrol car.

I'll proffer, Your Honor, that it indeed falls within the interior of the patrol car and begins to burn. Another co-defendant then pours on an accelerant and it lights the entire patrol car aflame.

Mr. Reeves, could we have Exhibit 6, please. Your Honor, at the protest turned riot, there were many, many, videos, and photographs. And this is one of Mr. Rojas who appears to be showing off, posing for a photograph. And in his left hand you see the lighter that he used to light the fabric on fire.

And then if we could move to Government

Exhibit 7, please, Mr. Reeves. This is a video, Your Honor, and I believe there is audio.

(Whereupon, Exhibit 7 was played for the record.)

MR. REEVES: Can the audio be heard by all.

MR. YEATES: Your Honor, the individual depicted in the video indicates that he put the car on fire.

And then, Your Honor, if I could have

Government Exhibit 8. After the car is fully aflame,
you will see in the background Mr. Rojas wearing the
same clothing. He has on a long-sleeve red and black
shirt, a gray undershirt, his khaki pants. He is
still wearing his white medical style mask and he
appears to be celebrating. In the video, Your Honor,
he walks from one side of the street to another, that
is Fourth South across the street from the library
and he is celebrating the burning of the patrol car.

Mr. Reeves, thank you for showing those exhibits.

Your Honor, based on that, the weight of the evidence and the nature and circumstances of the offense, the Government would ask the Court to find that those both weigh heavily in favor of detention.

But there is one -- at least one other area we have

to discuss and that is the Defendant's history and characteristics pursuant to 3142(g)(3)(A) and there is some material in the Pretrial Services Report that I will cover, but there is also some material that was left out of the report that the Court should be aware of.

So first, Your Honor, I mentioned the lack of candor with pretrial. The fact that he made statements that differed with those of his mother. The second is that clearly the defendant has a history of abusing alcohol. Third, Your Honor, it appears that he has been under employed for a number of months and that under employment will continue.

He is currently charged with a DUI offense and is facing that offense in state or perhaps municipal court. Also, Your Honor, the report indicates that Mr. Rojas has failed to appear six times which is a pattern of failures to appear. In addition, he has failed to comply with court orders and has a pattern of doing so.

There are four cases that aren't mentioned in the Pretrial Services Report that are relevant to the Court's determination here. In court case 155004879, in Logan Justice Court, the Defendant was charged with a minor offense, stop light violation.

However, he failed to appear on the citation. He was charged with that failure to appear and he was convicted of the same. That took place, Your Honor, in 2016.

Next, in Logan, in case 165004135, the

Defendant was charged with two minor violations. A

speeding and a driving on a denied license. However,

he exacerbated the situation by failing to appear on

the citation and again in that case he was found

guilty of the same. That also took place, Your

Honor, in 2016.

The third case I would bring to the Court's attention is a traffic offense involving failure to register or expired tags, speeding, and driving on a denied license. Again, showing a habit, Your Honor, of violating the mandate of the Driver's License Division, he was driving on a suspended or denied driver's license.

And then the last case in Utah that I will bring to the Court's attention is a 2019-case where he was charged with driving without proof of insurance, as well as driving on a suspended or revoked license. He was later convicted of the driving on suspended or revoked license. Again, Your Honor, thumbing his nose at the Driver's License

Division.

2.1

Your Honor, when I look at his history of failures to appear and failures to comply, and his repeated insistence on driving on suspended or denied driver's license, what I see is a clear pattern that the Defendant is not going to follow court orders nor is he going to abide by the restrictions placed upon his driver's license.

Finally, Your Honor, before I end, I will indicate that the Court should find the nature and seriousness and danger of the community that the Defendant created when he lit a patrol car on fire in a major city thoroughfare.

Your Honor, he placed every one there in danger. Himself, protestors, rioters, police officers, media, and casual observers. All of them could have been harmed by the patrol car which, loaded with ammunition, had bullets exploding due to the fire.

Based on this, Your Honor, the United States would ask the Court to find both that Mr. Rojas presents an unmanageable danger to the community and also an unmanageable risk of nonappearance and we would ask that he be detained pending trial.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Yeates.

Mr. Berardi?

2.1

MR. BERARDI: Your Honor, well, to begin with I think this is actually one of the most easily manageable cases. Looking at these -- looking at these pictures in this video that Mr. Yeates has shown us, his contentions, if I recall them, is one he says that there is discrepancies between Mr. Rojas and what his mother stated. There may very well be. But the person who knows the facts the best is Mr. Rojas. I haven't heard anything that says anything he stated wasn't true. Everything that he did state that he told the interviewer was correct.

I notice that the report -- in the report, if I can just pull it up here a second, um, states that the four reasons of contention is one of them is that he has ties to a foreign country. I don't know where that information comes from. I mean there is nothing in the report that says that. I mean he is born in California and he lives here now. He has lived here now for the last 12 years. His whole family lives here. His mother lives here, his father lives here, his brothers live here. I don't see -- I don't know how they drew this conclusion for a foreign country. I'm assuming they're saying it is Mexico, but I don't see any -- any link whatsoever.

I don't see anything that shows that he is a flight risk. He has got no place to go. All his ties are here.

His failure to appear history, as Mr. Yeates pointed out, they all go back to 2016 in a situation where he had moved, he didn't even know about the tickets until after the fact. When he found out about them, he took care of them all, he paid all of the fines off and he paid everything off. The driving on suspension comes from the fact that after he had paid everything, he still owed a reinstatement fee which nobody told him about. And so while he presumed his license was valid then, he still needed to pay \$65.00 to get his license reinstated. That's -- that's where that charge comes from.

Looking at his history which is minimal, I don't see anything that says he is a risk to the community or he certainly is not a flight risk. I mean it seems like he has a GPS monitor on him, um, boom, he is easily controlled and monitored.

I don't -- I don't see what the issue would be there. Let me -- oh, and one of the pictures, I hadn't had a chance to see those before where the car is on fire, is that the police car or is that a different car? I couldn't tell. I thought it was a

different vehicle.

THE COURT: There are two different vehicles. One is the police car and another is another car that was burned apparently near he was standing by.

MR. BERARDI: Okay. So all right. That's what I noticed. Like I said, those are my arguments and I don't see anything that was untruthful in anything he stated to the interviewer. I couldn't be there because he couldn't three-way the call through the jail or something. So...

THE COURT: Very well. So I'm prepared to make my ruling. Under 18 USC 3142, I have to make two determinations and I have to base those determinations on a series of factors.

One of the things that I don't decide is guilt or innocence. That has nothing to do with me at this point in time. What I have to decide is whether Mr. Rojas is an unmanageable risk of failure to not -- to appear; and second, whether he is a danger to the community. Danger to the community doesn't necessarily mean violent acts toward someone or somebody, but rather it simply means the ability -- that he is likely to commit other crimes in addition to the potential violent acts.

The factors that I have to consider is I have to consider number one there is a presumption of detention in this case because the charge that he is now facing carries with it, by congress's mandate, a presumption of detention. We accept that he is presumed detained and basically he needs to rebut that presumption, but the Government, the United States, bears the burden of proof throughout the proceeding.

2.1

Number two, I have to consider the nature and circumstances of the offense charged. This is a very serious offense. Lighting a car on fire in plain daylight is a very serious offense. And so that's -- that is certainly something that weights in favor of detention.

The nature -- the weight of the evidence.

That is at least the Ninth Circuit has indicated the least important factor that I have to consider, but I would suggest the weight of the evidence here is certainly strong, the fact that there is photographic and video evidence of this taking place.

At the same time we have to consider the history and characteristics of the person to determine whether he is indeed unmanageable.

Although the Court does have some concern with these

failures to not appear, they appear to have an explanation. Moreover, I do not see kind of the history of repeated criminal behavior and drug use and other things that we see in other cases that typically warrant some type of detention to say that an individual is unmanageable either because he or she is danger to the community or because he or she is a risk of flight.

2.1

The failures to not appear while certainly concerning to me and I hope it would be perfectly clear this is not traffic court in Logan. This is federal court.

MR. BERARDI: Correct.

THE COURT: If there is a failure to appear, there are consequences for that.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Sorry, I'm not quite there

Mr. Rojas, but I'm doing my ruling. We'll hear from
you at the right time if your attorney thinks it is a
good idea.

Because of the person's character, relationships to others in the community, that's one thing I have to consider in addition to whether he is already under supervision which appears that he isn't. And does he pose any particular danger to any

one person or to a segment of the community. And I just don't see any evidence that he does.

So what I'm going to do, is I am not going to order the Defendant detained. However, I'm going to put him on a number of conditions, the violation of which will indeed bring a revisiting of this under Section 3148. And if he is unable to abide by those conditions, then detention is certainly going to be a valid option.

So these are the conditions that I'm going to impose. Number one, the Defendant needs to maintain or actively seek verifiable employment. The work as you go as the audio engineer stuff comes up that is not going to cut it. You need to be out looking for a job or getting an education in some sort of an educational program that is approved by a pretrial officer.

Number two, I would expect you to abide by conditions in terms of the following. Number one, maintain a residence. You do not change that residence without permission from the pretrial officer. Number two, you do not travel outside of the State of Utah without permission from the pretrial officer. And there will be no travel outside of the United States period. If you have a

passport, I would ask you to turn that in to the pretrial services officer immediately. If you don't have a passport, then I would order you not to apply for one. I'm ordering you to avoid all contact with others that are named in this case, who are considered to be alleged victims or potential witnesses, and co-defendants. In fact, one of the things that the law requires me to warn you of on conditions of release, is if there is any association in terms of trying to obstruct justice, obstruct the criminal investigation, intimidate witnesses, that is one of the offenses that would be an additional offense to the one with which you are charged. law requires me to advise you of that fact. You are not to use alcohol period, nor frequent any establishment where alcohol is the main item of order.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You are not to possess any narcotic drug regardless of whether it is legal in some other state. If it is under the federal controlled substances laws, it is -- it is on those schedules, it is forbidden under federal law you are not to possess it and not to use it.

You are to submit to drug and alcohol testing as directed by the pretrial services officer.

And I am going to order you to pay at least a part of that or all of it depending on your current financial circumstances.

2.1

You will also submit your person, residence, and your vehicle to searches that will be conducted by the pretrial officer at a reasonable time, in a reasonable manner, based on reasonable suspicion of contraband or evidence of a violation or condition of release. Failure to submit to that may result in revocation of these conditions.

And, of course, you are to abide by all state court hearings which now may be pending and the conditions imposed by those state courts. Failure to not appear in a state court proceeding to me amounts to a violation of the conditions that I am now imposing which would be problematic and something I am certain you don't want to deal with.

Those -- that is my order in terms of Mr. Rojas's release. Are there any questions about the extent of my order? I understand that there may be disagreement with it, but does anyone have any questions as to what was ordered?

MR. YEATES: Not the United States.

THE COURT: Mr. Berardi, any questions? If you're talking you're probably on mute.

MR. BERARDI: No, Your Honor. No questions on that. I did have one question as far as the deadlines for the case. Does the Court know what that deadline was for motions?

THE COURT: Mr. Yeates, do you happen to have that? I do not have those deadlines in front of me.

MR. YEATES: Your Honor, I can probably find it quickly but it would probably be easier for Mr. Berardi to simply go to the hearing with Mr. Patton that has all of the --

MR. BERARDI: That's fine, Your Honor. I just thought if the Court knew it I was just asking. No problem.

THE COURT: What we'll do there is when we issue our minute entry order for this hearing, we can find those deadlines and put them in there. Just we all have agreed we're going to abide by them, so we'll put them in there so you can put them on your calendar.

In addition to those conditions, I do have by law to warn you not to violate Section 1503, 1510, 1512, or 1513 of the United States Code which as I mentioned before deals with being charged with intimidation for retaliation against witnesses,

jurors, or court officers, or obstruction of a criminal investigation. And under 18 USC 3147, there is an enhanced penalty of up to ten years in prison for crimes that are committed while on pretrial release.

So with those warnings, which will be coming out in our conditions of release as well, I order that the Defendant is to be released pending those conditions and this Court will be in recess.

MR. YEATES: Your Honor, may I bring up one issue?

THE COURT: Certainly.

MR. YEATES: Your Honor, the issue as to discovery. First, I would ask whether Mr. Berardi is going to move for discovery pursuant to Rule 16.

MR. BERARDI: Your Honor, I have those -- I have that and my appearance ready to be filed. There was a problem with my password last night and I spoke with the clerk today. They said they would have that resolved by tomorrow so I will formally file those tomorrow.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Berardi. Thank you, Mr. Yeates. How long would you need to produce discovery or has it already been produced to the other co-defendants?

1 MR. YEATES: It has not been produced. 2 We're scheduled to produce the first notice of 3 compliance on the 10th of this month, so six days 4 from now. I want to inform the Court that we have 5 many, many terabytes of video. And we understand the 6 first production will be approximately three 7 terabytes of information and there will be additional 8 terabytes to follow. 9 But we would ask, one, that Mr. Berardi make 10 a formal oral motion for discovery here. And two, 11 that he supply at least a three terabyte hard drive 12

to the U.S. Attorney's Office so that we can upload the first notice of compliance production.

THE COURT: Mr. Berardi, do you make a motion for discovery?

MR. BERARDI: I do, Your Honor. I move for discovery and I will provide a three terabyte drive. Do you want me to just drop that off at your office?

MR. YEATES: That would be ideal,

Mr. Berardi. Thank you.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. BERARDI: Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you both for your cooperation in that regard. Is there anything else we need to discuss at today's hearing?

MR. KING: Your Honor, if I may?

1 THE COURT: Yes, Mr. King.

MR. KING: I -- I apologize if I didn't hear it, but I am not sure that you ordered the no weapons, no firearms condition.

THE COURT: If I omitted that that was unintentional. But yes, there is to be no possession of firearms, ammunition, or destructive device or dangerous weapon.

MR. KING: Okay. And one other thing, you did talk about his employment. I should mention that he does do sound engineering at some bars which would fall under the condition of not going anywhere where alcohol is the main -- the chief item.

THE DEFENDANT: That is my only income, just so you know.

MR. KING: The chief item of order. Um, is it the Court's intention to not allow him to go to those places or to allow him to go to those places under the being employed only for employment.

THE COURT: So two questions there, I appreciate the clarification. The first is the following. The current what I understand the sound engineer job is few and far between especially right now with COVID. That's a problem for the Court and so I think Mr. Rojas needs to go out and find a

different job that is going to keep him employed gainfully every single day.

MR. KING: Sure.

2.1

THE COURT: Part two is if he decides to do that on a part-time basis kind of a gig by gig basis so to speak, then the Court would allow him to be in those places for purposes of employment. However, if he decides to imbibe in the products, in the alcoholic products that are there, that would be deemed a violation of his conditions.

So number one, so just to be clear, he needs to find a job that is going too be occupying his time daily. If he decides to do this on a case-by-case basis he may. And if it requires him to go into an establishment where alcohol is the main -- at least the main service item, then he is -- he can go in there for employment purposes only but he is not to engage in partaking of that substance or that will be a violation of his conditions.

MR. KING: Thank you for the clarification, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you for raising that. We need to make sure it is clear for everyone's understanding. We don't want misunderstandings. The stakes are too high.

```
1
                 THE DEFENDANT: I understand.
2
                 THE COURT: Any questions?
3
                 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
4
                 MR. BERARDI: Could I just talk to Mr. Rojas
5
       just briefly? I don't care if -- I don't need a
6
       separate room or nothing. Just --
7
                 THE COURT: Well, let's just put you in a
8
       separate room. We can dismiss everyone. I will -- I
9
       can just do that right now and then when you're done
10
       the Zoom call will be over. So I'll just put you two
11
       in a breakout room and we will adjourn this hearing.
12
                 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.
13
                 MR. BERARDI: Thank you.
14
                (Whereupon, the hearing concluded.)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript was taken from a tape recording stenographically to the best of my ability to hear and understand said tape recording, that my said stenographic notes were thereafter transcribed into typewriting at my direction. Dated this 10th day of August, 2020. Laura W. Robinson